

Remarks

Applicant thanks Examiner Blankenship for the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application upon entry of this Amendment. Of the pending claims, claims 16-20 have been indicated as being allowed. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 9, 11, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claim 10 has been canceled. No new matter has been added. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 9 and 16 are the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Specification

The paragraph beginning on page 2, at line 5 of the Specification has been amended for consistency with Figure 2 (as originally filed) and claim 4 (as amended). In addition, the paragraph beginning on page 6, at line 1 of the Specification has been amended to correct minor grammatical and typographical errors. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner stated that the "second and third seals have a similar configuration and are connected by the first seal" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claims(s). By this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claim 4, which originally comprised the cited language, for consistency with Figure 2. As a result, the feature specified in claim 4 (as amended) is shown in Figure 2 (as originally filed) and the objection is believed to be overcome. A corrected drawing has not been submitted as the Applicant has amended claim 4 to remove the objected feature.

Claim Objections

Claims 10-15 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has indicated that claims 10-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this Amendment, the Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to include what is believed to be the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 10 (now canceled). Accordingly, the objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 was rejected under § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has amended dependent claim 4 to more particularly claim the invention. Support for the amendment to claim 4 may be found, for example, in the Figures at FIG. 2 and in the claims 1 and 3 (as originally filed). As a result, no new matter has been added and the objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-9 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,853,030, issued to Walding (hereinafter "Walding"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,111,234 issued to Wells et al. (hereinafter "Wells").

The Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable over Walding and Wells and has amended independent claim 1 to more clearly define thereover. In particular, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to more particularly claim, inter alia, that the first seal circumscribes the inlet opening for inhibiting air leakage. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example, in the Figures at FIG. 2. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Walding generally discloses a pipe coupling with a disinfectant injection port. (Walding, Title). As illustrated in FIG. 2 of Walding, the seal (52) cited by the Examiner as forming a first seal proximate an opening does not circumscribe the opening, even if the element (14) is capable of being mounted on a vehicle's mounting surface which the Applicant further contends is not the case. Accordingly, Walding fails to disclose each and every

limitation of the claimed invention (as amended) and the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Wells generally discloses a permanent repair clamp for pipes adapted to be installed over a single or double ended pipe bell in a range of sizes. (Wells, Abstract). As illustrated in FIG. 2 of Wells, the seal (19) cited by the Examiner as forming a first seal proximate an opening does not circumscribe the opening, even if the element (13) is capable of being mounted on a vehicle's mounting surface which the Applicant further contends is not the case. Accordingly, Wells fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention (as amended) and the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Accordingly, neither Walding nor Wells disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention (as amended) and the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to independent claim 9, the Examiner rejected claim 9 but indicated that claims 10-15 (which depend from claim 9) would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, the Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to include what is believed to be the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 10 (now canceled). Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 9 is believed to be overcome.

Regarding claims which depend from claims 1, 9 or 16, Applicant contends that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 9 and 16 are patentable. Moreover, Applicants contend that these claims recite further limitations, in addition to the limitations of claims 1, 9 and 16 which render these claims additionally patentable.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicant believes all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due as a result of the filing of this paper. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL P. SCHOEMANN et al.

By Timothy J. Marsh
Timothy J. Marsh
Reg. No. 56,684
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 10, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351